

Did 'Umar ibn al-Khattab Burn the house of Fatimah al-Zahra?

Responding to Shia Inconsistencies and Lies.

THANKS TO: PHAKHIOLOGY, MAHAJJAH.COM, AND MORE



By: Sawt al-Haqq

Contents

<u>Where did the basis of such a Hateful Lie come from?...</u>	<u>Page 3</u>
<u>Why do we need to refute the Shia?.....</u>	<u>Page 4</u>
<u>The <i>Kufr</i> of such a people.....</u>	<u>Page 5</u>
<u>Refuting Tarikh al-Tabari.....</u>	<u>Page 6</u>
<u>Refuting Al-Ansab al-Ashraf.....</u>	<u>Page 7</u>
<u>Refuting Musannaf ibn Abi Shaybah.....</u>	<u>Page 9</u>
<u>The Hadith in Sahih al-Bukhari.....</u>	<u>Page 12</u>
<u>Scholarly Opinion.....</u>	<u>Page 13</u>

Where did the Basis of such a Hateful Lie Come From?

The Basis of such a Lie created by the Shia is not a newfound topic, in the Famous Shia Hadith Book *Bihar al-Anwar* it's said:

“Taqiyya is obligatory and it's impermissible to leave it until the Mahdi rises and he who left it has broken the rule of Allah and his Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wa ali) and the Imams (alayhom salam).” [1]

What does this even mean?

To Answer this question, let me say الحمد لله that I have the ability to refute the Rafidha and their claims in which they use to misguide us. The Shia Sheikh Al-Shirazi says in his book:

“it can be for other purposes as well, like spreading the message in a better way!” [2]

So basically, hes saying that Taqiyyah is used as a way to lie to people to spread to them the message of their faith, so that they can get close to you and then eventually misguide us! Even the shia sheikh Mohsin al-Hakeem says:

“What we benefit from the narrations of Taqiyya is that they were legislated so that the Shia may hide from their opponents, and so that they may not be known for their Shiasm and Rafidhism” [3]

[1]. Bihar al-Anwar 75/421

[2]. Al-Qawa'id al-Fiqhiyyah 1/410

[3]. Al-Mustamsak 2/332

Why do we need to Refute the Shia?

Because they have misguided our Brothers and Sisters in Islam! They feed us lies and weak ahadith they can't justify and hide the truth of themselves so that they can grow in numbers, its like the saying of Allāh in the Qur'an:

“O’ You who has believed! whoever of you should revert from his religion - Allāh will bring forth [in place of them] a people He will love and who will love Him [who are] humble toward the believers, strong against the disbelievers;”

My Brothers! Do not grieve that the Rafidha are feeding such horrible lies to those people who are our brothers and straying them from Ahlul Sunnah! Allāh will indeed replace them with a people whom believe and will do good, we are a brotherhood and our duty is to stop our brothers from entering disbelief. Allah says in the Qur'an:

“The believers are but one brotherhood, so make peace between your brothers. And be mindful of Allah so you may be shown mercy.”

So Brothers! Learn about your religion to stop the shia from misguiding the rest of our community! Memorise the Book of Allāh so as not to be misguided by the words of the Innovators! Ibn Qudamah (D620AH) was reported to have said:

“The Salaf used to forbid sitting with the People of Innovations, looking into their books and listening to their words.”

Ibn Sirin even once refused an innovator to read the Qur'an to him! He said: **“I disliked that they read an Ayāh to me and then distort it, so that this falls into my heart.”**

How strong are the words of the Innovators! We stay away from them in all of our deeds! It is more beloved for me to burn my ears open and my tongue off than listen and engage with an innovator in a debate, speak, or argument!

The Kufr of Such a People

This specific group of the Shia, the Rafidha, are (upon an ijmaa') Infidels.

Imam ash-Shafi'i Said Regarding them:

"I have not seen among the heretics a people more famous for falsehood than the Rafidhi Shia."

He Also said:

"Narrate knowledge from everyone you meet except for the Rafidhi Shia, because they invent Ahadith and adopt them as part of their religion."

Imam Abu Hanifa was reported to say about them:

"Whoever doubts their disbelief has disbelieved himself."

Imam Malik said regarding a Rafidhi:

"Do not speak to them or narrate from them, for surely they are liars."

Which other Scholars have called the Rafidha Disbelievers?

- Sheikh Abdul 'Aziz ibn Baz
- Sheikh Nassiruddin Al-Albani
- Allama Ash-Shanqiti
- Sheikh An-Nashashibi
- Imam Ahmad Ameen
- Dr. Rashad Salim

That's only a small list! The kufr of such a *Qawm* is known amongst us as Ahlul-Sunnah! Another thing is that they affirm that the Qur'an has been distorted. For example, in their book Al-Kafi H 15018, Muhammad narrates from Ahmad from ibn Fadhl that Imam Reza read the verse 9:40 saying "على رسوله" instead of the correct term used in the Qur'an which is "عليه".

[1]

So basically what they narrate is that their Imam Read the Qur'an incorrectly How false is this? We have respect for Imam Reza and and Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq whom they also accused of reciting this verse with such a miniscule yet large alteration.

And so we ask the Shia — are you truly the followers of Ahlul-Bayt? Or are you Followers of Misguidance and Lies? Let's get into Refuting now.

Tarikh al-Tabari

The Book Tarikh al-Tabari is a History book collected by the scholar Al-Tabari, He mentioned a hadith of ‘Umar supposedly burning down the house of Fatimah:

“By Allah I will burn the house down or you will come to pledge allegiance!”

This Narration is completely weak due to 2 Reasons:

The Weakness of Ibn Humayd

The Disconnection of Ziyad ibn Kulayb

Ibn Humayd:

Ibn Humayd is a weak narrator whom ibn Hajar weakened along with 4 other major hadith scholars such as: Ibn Shaybah, Al-Bukhari, Al-Nasa’i, and Fadlak al-Razi. [1]

This Narrator being in the Isnad on its own is Weak. This hadith cannot be used as an excuse to frame ‘Umar for such a disgusting deed, in which he never even committed!

The Disconnection of Ziyad ibn Kulayb:

This Narrator was reported to have passed away in 110AH-119AH, this was mentioned in Tahdhib al-Kamal and so theres no way to say that he could have recorded an event in 11AH, or he would be 1 years old at the time of it happening, or rather he would be up to 8 which is still not a valid age and quite basically impossible because **Jabir narrated from the Prophet of Allāh ﷺ**:

“There is no soul born upon the earth – (meaning during this generation) – upon whom will come one hundred (or more) years.” [2]

How is it possible that he narrates an event he wasn’t even alive to see? This hadith is Disconnected and Da’if for 2 Separate Reasons.

[1]. Tahdhib al-Tahdhib 8/82

[2]. Sahih al-Bukhari 116

Ansab al-Ashraf

This hadith is of the 2 most authentic of the many the Rafidha bring to us, even though this hadith is the most authentic of them its still inauthentic which presents us a fairly large problem: how would the hadith most worthy of authentication still be weak?

The Refutation:

the first inconsistency here is the break between ibn 'Awn and the actual event happening, ibn 'Awn was born in 46AH or 66AH and the event of the House burning was in 11AH,

this is a break in the chain and it is completely da'if due to multiple factors: The interrupted is weak by the consensus of scholars because he lost a condition of acceptance, which is the connection of the hadith.

an example is shown in the hadith of Mehdi establishing a straight path,, There is a break in two places, Abdul Razzaq did not hear from al-Thawri and al-Thawri did not hear him from Abu Ishaq, this is interrupted.

the hadith here has the break in the chain at the start and so this hadith is considered mu'allaq da'if, not like the mu'allaq in the collection of Imam Muslim رحمه الله, where the isnad is found elsewhere and completed, this makes the hadith mu'allaq sahih, however this doesn't occur in this situation.

another thing is the multiple other fatawa we can find in the book "Usool al-Hadith":

in Sahih Muslim is the mentioning of a hadith, we see that all narrators are omitted except for 1:

‘Aishah said, “The Prophet ﷺ covered his thighs when ‘Uthman entered.” [1]
this is quite legitimately how it was narrated in Muslim’s collection, however
theres no problem in that because the true isnad is found elsewhere.
however this hadith is considered as not among that, [2]

in Usul al-Hadith pg. 50-51 we see that it says:

“Mu‘allaq Ahadith are generally automatically classified da‘if and rejected
because one of the conditions of authenticity is missing, except if they are
mentioned in hadith collections in which the authors spent great efforts to
only include saheeh hadeeths (e.g. Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim)”

and we also see on page 53:

“Mu‘allaq narrations in other collections are generally considered da‘if
regardless of how they are mentioned by the authors, active or passive
voice.”

and this hadith in Ansab al-Ashraf is not found in any of the 2 Sahihayn and
so we reject it completely because of the clear disconnection in the chain
skipping 30+ years.

So now how is a hadith which skips all of these years possibly going to be
used as a proof amongst such a group of people who are required to reject
such a hadith, created to defame a righteous person who is worthy of the
Khilifah being attributed to him by the Rasul ﷺ? How is it even possible for
you to call such a righteous person unrighteous because of an act he didn’t
even commit?

[1] Sahih Muslim, vol. 4, pg. 1281, #5906

[2] Usul al-Hadith pg. 49

Musannaf ibn Abi Shaybah

This Hadith is generally the most authentic narration regarding this, however this STILL doesn't exempt it from its weakness! Let's take a look at its isnad:

Muhammad ibn Bishr narrates from UbaidAllah ibn 'Umar from Zaid ibn Aslam from his father Aslam.

So the Narrator Aslam hears Fatimah al-Zahra say:

"Do you know what 'Umar has said to me? He swore by Allah that if you do not come out of the house, he will set my house on fire and by Allah, he will certainly do it!"

A very Plausible scenario indeed, however we forget a very important part of this:

The Narrator Aslam is the Slave of 'Umar! And we all know (by logic.) that the Slave of someone would follow them around, as we can see in the same narration directly before

"As soon as Umar left"

If 'Umar already left how would Aslam hear what Fatimah has said? Aslam narrating from Fatimah when he was already gone is a fairly large issue and Walid Isma'il mentioned this issue.

Even if this hadith WAS Sahih (which it isn't) then there would be another issue; 'Umar didn't burn down the house of Fatimah in this narration! Trying to strength this hadith would be a contradiction in itself because most of the time the Rafidha would try to authenticate all of the ahadith instead of just 1, if they prove this one then they proved nothing because:

1. Zubayr Gave Bay'ah to Abu Bakr
 2. Fatimah died pleased with Abu Bakr
 3. 'Ali gave Bay'ah to Abu Bakr aswell,
-

The Rafidha would rather hide this evidence than actually show it to us.

The Bayah of Zubayr:

A hadith mentioned by Al-Bayhaqi, Part of a longer hadith reads:

“Al-Zubayr said: “Don’t rebuke, o’ Caliph of the Messenger of Allah!”
— Thereupon he gave his pledge to Abu Bakr.”

In this hadith is a proof which the Shi’a would deny and attempt to prove this wrong and say that Az-Zubayr gave Bay’ah by force, however we will prove them incorrect below:

Al-Hakim in Al-Mustadrak ‘ala Sahihayn said: “This Hadith is Sahih according to the conditions of the Shaykhayn who did not narrate it.” [1]

Imam Muslim asked ibn Khuzaymah about this hadith, Imam Muslim said:

“This hadith is worth a *Badnah*.”

Ibn Khuzaymah replies back:

“A badnah? Rather this hadith is worth a *Badrah*!” [2]

This Hadith is mentioned Sahih twice in Al-Sunan al-Kubra. [3]

[1] Al-Mustadrak ‘ala Sahihayn 80/3

[2] A Badnah (بدنه) is a type of Camel or Ox which was sacrificed in accordance with the *Shari’a*. ibn Mansour says in Lizan al-Arab: “It falls under the she-camel, the cow, and the male camel, which is permissible in sacrifice.”, while a Badrah (بدرة) is typically a purse — or something which contains a large sum of money, which is usually 10,000 dirhams; or more.

[3] Al-Sunan al-Kubra by al-Bayhaqi 8/143

The Bayah of 'Ali:

Some Shias may attempt to say that 'Ali gave Bayah to him out of force and needing to do so to "save Islam" but we can conclude that this is a baseless lie, as we see again and again.

Imam Muslim رحمه الله mentions in his *Sahih*:

"Then 'Ali stood up and spoke highly of Abu Bakr, **and he mentioned his virtue and the fact that he had been one of the first to enter Islam**. Then he went to Abu Bakr and **swore allegiance** to him, and the people came to 'Ali and said: You have done the right thing, you have done well. And the people became close to Ali when he did the right thing.'

Although 'Ali gave Bayah to Abu Bakr late this does not make the Bayah worth less, as Imam an-Nawawi said:

With regard to 'Ali رضي الله عنه delaying swearing of allegiance (to Abu Bakr), 'Ali mentioned it (i.e finished with the Bayah) in this hadith and Abu Bakr apologised to him."

Fatimah Dying Pleased with Abu Bakr:

In Al-Bayhaqi's book *Al-Sunan al-Kubra* he mentions a hadith:

on the authority of al-Sha'bi that he said: "When Fatima fell ill, Abu Bakr al-Siddiq came to her and asked permission for her, so Ali said: Oh Fatima, is this Abu Bakr asking permission for you? Would you like me to give him permission? He said: Yes, so I gave permission to him, so he entered upon her to please her, and he said: By God, I did not leave the house and the money, and the family and the clan, except to seek the pleasure of Allah, the pleasure of His Messenger, and the pleasure of you, Ahlul Bayt and then you are satisfied with it until I am satisfied." [1]

[1] Al-Sunan al-Kubra 6/301

I'm guessing a shia would try to throw at me the Hadith in Sahih al-Bukhari, for that I reply with this:

The Hadith in Sahih al-Bukhari

This hadith is Authentic according to Al-Bukhari and Muslim however this hadith has *idraj* [1] and so we need to look at something important — Al-Zuhri interpreted this hadith, at the end we see

“(Az-Zuhri said, "They have been managed in this way till today.")”

This is a pointing that Al-Zuhri has interpreted this hadith and committed idraj:

Ibn Rajab records the following opinion of Imam Bukhari:

Al-Zuhri would narrate Ahadith and on **most occasions would insert sentences from his own self**. Some of these would be Mursal and some of them would be his own. [1]

Al-Zuhri narrating things and adding something to the hadith is not unheard of, we don't reject the hadith, we only reject partially what was added to the hadith.

For example, the narration found in Sahih al-Bukhari 3092-3093 is an example of one which was narrated by Al-Zuhri and is the only one which mentioned the anger of Fatimah at Abu Bakr, the other ones which are narrated by for example Abu Hurairah, Umm Hani, and more simply mention silence and there isn't a problem because they didn't witness Fatimah passing away pleased with Abu Bakr.

So Shias, I ask you to simply read any hadith which mentions this and read if any of them (except for what Al-Zuhri said) mention Anger.

[1] Fatih al-Bari vol. 5 pg. 286

Scholarly Opinion

Unfortunately from the Shi'a Rafidha is the group of people who turn away from the scholars instead of actually taking their word, especially considering they are all more learned than me and almost anyone they will speak to regarding this, because they wish to recruit people into Shi'ism.

So first I'll start by showing the opinions of scholars on the burning of the house and then show the opinions of the scholars who "accepted" it and then refute those.

The Scholars whom Rejected it:

Ibn Taymiyyah says in Minhaj al-Sunnah:

As for him harming them, this is something in which he never did, according to the *ijmaa'* of the people of knowledge and religion. "These are ignorant lies, and fools believe it." is reported by the scholars, who say: "The Companions demolished Fatima's house, and beat her in the stomach until she miscarried." This is all a fabricated claim, and a fabricated falsehood, according to the consensus of the people of Islam. [1]

Islamweb.net mentions:

"What is mentioned of the companions burning the House of Fatimah, may Allāh be pleased with her, and lost her baby (Mohsin) is a false appearance and from Satan."

[1]. Minhaj as-Sunnah volume 8 pg. 291

Mahajjah.com says:

“The incident of the house being set on fire and Sayyidah Fatimah *radiya Llahu `anha*—may our parents be sacrificed for her—being assaulted and then miscarrying her child is not mentioned in any book of the Ahlus Sunnah. It is an outright fabrication and pure work of fiction.”

Ibn Abi Hadid (Shi’a Scholar [1]) says:

“Concerning what he reported of raiding Fatimah’s house and gathering firewood to burn it, it is a solitary narration and is unreliable. It is also not relied upon in respect of the Sahabah nor any of the Muslims whose honesty is manifest.” [2]

[1] ibn Kathir said he was a ghali (overexaggerating) Shia and Sheikh [3] al-Tehrani mentioned him in Al-Zaniyah al-Tasnif al-Shia (The Names of the books of the Shia) and so he was most likely attributed to the Shia, even if he was sunni he is described as a mu’tazili and someone who takes ‘Ali as the first caliph meaning he leans to the Shia more.

[2]. Sharh Nahj al-Balagha vol. 4 pg. 631

[3] I use the word “Sheikh” here for only 1 of 2 reasons: The old age of the forementioned individual, or the intense knowledge of an individual, in this scenario I use the word for the latter.